

## A NEW MANUSCRIPT OF THE *DE CERIMONIIS*

CYRIL MANGO and IHOR ŠEVČENKO

OUR text of the *De Cerimoniis* by Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus is based almost exclusively on one manuscript, the *Lipsiensis Rep. i. 17* (or *Bibl. Urb. 28*) which has been held to be of the end of the eleventh, of the twelfth, or even of the early thirteenth century. The report of its destruction during the Second World War is apparently unfounded.<sup>1</sup> In addition to the *Lipsiensis*, two other manuscripts have been known, but both of these contain only tiny parts of the text: the *Hieros. S. Sepulchri* 39 (saec. XII–XIII) which preserves a portion of the *Cletorologion* of Philotheus,<sup>2</sup> and the *Laurent. Plut.* 55,4 (saec. X) of which only one folio (1r–1v) pertains to the Book of Ceremonies.<sup>3</sup>

The recent catalogue of the manuscripts of the Oecumenical Patriarchate by Aimilianos Tsakopoulos has drawn our attention to *Cod. Chalcensis S. Trinitatis* (125) 133 containing works of St. Ephraem Syrus. The

author of the catalogue states that 116 folios of this manuscript are a palimpsest and that the original, erased text is a historical one, since it contains such words as *σπαθάριος*, *πρωτονοτάριος*, *πατρίκιος*, *στρατηγός*, etc.<sup>4</sup> A microfilm of this manuscript, obtained through the gracious permission of the Holy Synod, has enabled us to ascertain that the earlier text is none other than the *De Cerimoniis*. The observations that follow are based on an examination of the microfilm alone.

The manuscript is a *membranaceus* and is mutilated both at the beginning and at the end. It consists of 281 folios;<sup>5</sup> of these, fols. 31–39, 64–93, 126–132 and 212–279, i.e. in reality 117 in all, are palimpsest. The non-palimpsest folios have twenty to twenty-two lines per page; in the palimpsest folios there are twenty-eight lines of *scriptura inferior* and, as a rule, twenty-five of *scriptura superior*. The present contents of the ms are as follows:

1r: *inc.* <σε> || αὐτὸν ἄγνον τήρησον = Ephraem, *De virtute*. The text begins in the middle of cap. ix (Assemani, *S. Ephraem Syri opera omnia*, I, 225E) and goes down to the end of cap. x.

5v: *In illud, attende tibi ipsi* (Assemani, I, 230ff.).

31r: *Non esse ridendum* (Assemani, I, 254ff.).

35v: *De vita spirituali* (Assemani, I, 258ff.).

54r: *De recta vivendi ratione* (Assemani, II, 56ff.).

65v: *Beatitudines* (Assemani, I, 282ff.).

70v: *Beatitudines aliae* (Assemani, I, 292ff.).

76v: *Paraeneseis* (Assemani, II, 72ff.). On fols. 181r–188r, after *Paraenesis* 44 (according to Assemani's numbering),

<sup>1</sup> M. Richard, *Répertoire des bibliothèques et des catalogues des manuscrits grecs*, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1958), p. 131, no. 482; J. Irigoin, "Pour une étude des centres de copie byzantins," *Scriptorium*, XIII/2 (1959), p. 179 and note 1. Professor Irigoin stresses the uniqueness of the *Lipsiensis* which he attributes to the tenth century. He further suggests that this ms, as well as a few others connected with the literary activity of Constantine VII, were kept in the imperial library "où l'on n'avait pas licence de les recopier" (p. 180). The existence of a second ms of the *De Cerimoniis* may somewhat invalidate this hypothesis. There appears to have been yet a third ms, now represented by a single folio of the *Laurent. Plut.* 55,4 (see *infra*, note 3).

<sup>2</sup> Corresponding to pp. 726–36 of the Bonn ed. This text has been collated by F. I. Uspenskij in *Izvestija Russk. Arkheol. Inst. v Konstant.*, III (1898), p. 98ff., and utilized by J. B. Bury in his ed. of the *Cletorologion: The Imperial Administrative System in the Ninth Century*, British Academy Supplemental Papers, I (London, 1911). Uspenskij (p. 101) observes that the *Cletorologion* must have circulated as an independent treatise.

<sup>3</sup> Corresponding to pp. 449–54 of the Bonn ed. See A. Vogt's ed. of the *De Cerimoniis*, I (Paris, 1935), p. vii, note 1.

<sup>4</sup> Περιγραφικός κατάλογος τῶν χειρογράφων τῆς βιβλιοθήκης τοῦ Οἰκουμενικοῦ Πατριαρχείου, II (Istanbul, 1956), pp. 152–3.

<sup>5</sup> The folios are numbered, somewhat haphazardly, from 1 to 279; two, which we may call 69bis and 214bis, have been overlooked.

is inserted the opusculum *De Heli sacerdote* (Assemani, III, 6ff.), after which the text of the *Paraeneseis* resumes.

215<sup>v</sup>: *De humilitate* (Assemani, I, 299ff.).

246<sup>v</sup>: *De divina gratia* (Assemani, III, 42ff.).

252<sup>r</sup>: *De morbo linguae* (Assemani, II, 279ff.).

263<sup>r</sup>: *Testamentum* (Assemani, II, 230ff.).

This breaks off with the words ἐν τραχώδι (sic) τό||<πφ> = Assemani, II, 245B.

The non-palimpsest folios appear to be in three or even four different hands. The script is archaizing and consequently difficult to date. It cannot, in any event, be earlier than the eleventh century, but may be considerably later. There are quire marks in the lower margin, extending from 7 on fol. 6<sup>v</sup> (last folio of a quire) to 43 on fol. 274<sup>r</sup>. It appears that the palimpsest folios are a later insertion to fill the gaps of a defective manuscript. The quire marks are either contemporary with the restoration of the manuscript or, as seems more probable, later. This may be deduced from the fact that one large gap, amounting to approximately one quaternion, was allowed to remain between fols. 109<sup>v</sup> and 110<sup>r</sup> (between εἰς τὸ ὑμῶν ὑστέρημα = Assemani, II, 102A and εὐθὺς καὶ παραχρῆμα = Assemani, II, 108A). The numbering of the quires takes no notice of this lacuna.

The *scriptura inferior* of the palimpsest folios appears to be of the eleventh century, a conclusion that is corroborated by the character of the rulings. In most cases only three lines of the original text per page have not been overwritten, though they have been erased: one at the top and two at the bottom. Naturally, the marginal scholia have not been overwritten either. In addition to this, there are five instances where about half of the page of the original text is legible, and two pages that have not been overwritten at all. The overwriting falls in most cases exactly over the lines of the original text, which makes decipherment difficult. On only two folios (267 and 272, surely a folded sheet) is the original script inverted with relation to the upper one.

When the manuscript of the *De Cerimoniis* was broken up for re-use, the sequence of its folios was thoroughly disturbed; this means that the text of each folio has to be identified separately. After a preliminary examination

we are in a position to state that our manuscript includes parts of both Books I and II as well as the *Cletorologion*; Book II and the *Cletorologion*, however, appear to be much more copiously represented than Book I. The number of textual variants with regard to the printed edition is very considerable, so that our manuscript surely does not belong to the family of the *Lipsiensis*.

It is naturally premature to assess the importance of the new manuscript before its text has been more fully deciphered. Two examples will have to suffice for the present. On page 681 of the Bonn edition is given the formula of salutation addressed to the Bulgarian envoys. This includes the sentence: πῶς ἔχουσιν ὁ Κανάρτι κείνος καὶ ὁ Βουλίας ταρκάνος οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ ἐκ θεοῦ ἀρχόντος Βουλγαρίας καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ αὐτοῦ τέκνα. In view of the considerable literature that has been devoted to the elucidation of these terms,<sup>6</sup> it is of interest to note that our manuscript has a scholion at this point (fol. 67<sup>v</sup>) which reads: ἰστέον δ(τ) τῶν ἀρχόντων Βουλγαρί(ας) οἱ υἱοὶ οὗτ(ως) ἐτιμῶντο Καναρτικεινο(ς) (καὶ) ὁ βουλίας <τ>αρκανος. This, it is true, is almost a repetition of the text; but it does confirm the spellings *Kanartikeinos* and *Bulias tarchanos* which have been repeatedly questioned, and it establishes that these were titles conferred on the sons of the kings of Bulgaria; not their proper names.<sup>7</sup>

The second example is of greater interest. The table of contents of Book II (Bonn ed., p. 513) lists, amongst others, the following titles: 41. Ὅσα εἶδη τῶν ἀλλαξιμῶν. 42. Ὑπόμνημα ἐν συντόμῳ τῶν βασιλευσάντων βασιλέων ἐν τῇδε τῇ μεγάλῃ καὶ εὐτυχιστάτῃ Κωνσταντινουπόλει ἀπὸ τοῦ μεγάλου καὶ εὐσεβεστάτου καὶ ἁγίου Κωνσταντίνου. In the *Lipsiensis*, however, only the beginning of chapter 41 is preserved and chapter 42 is entirely missing; according to Reiske's note (I, 641; II, 754), one or more folia were lacking at this point. In reality the lacuna is quite considerable. Our manuscript has more of chapter 41 than the *Lipsiensis* (fol. 224<sup>v</sup>); it also contains three

<sup>6</sup> Bibliography in Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, 2nd ed. II, (Berlin, 1958), p. 148, s.v. κανάρτι κείνος, and p. 107, s.v. βουλίας.

<sup>7</sup> Thus G. Balaščev in *Izv. Russk. Arkheol. Inst. v Konst.*, IV/3 (1899), p. 219, has suggested that Boulias was a proper name.

ка  
кв  
и

КГ

利



[illegible]

folia (126, 212, 214bis) that must surely belong to the lost chapter 42. These are written in the form of a chronicle with the names of the emperors in the margin. Folio 212 covers the period from Zeno to Phocas, folio 214bis from Heraclius to Tiberius Apsimar, and folio 126 from Alexander to Romanus II. We may postulate the loss of one folio giving the story from Constantine I to Zeno, and probably two from Tiberius Apsimar to Alexander.

We present here reproductions of two pages of our ms to serve as palaeographic

specimens. Figure 1 (fol. 39<sup>r</sup>), *inc.* ὁ δὲ πατριάρχης *des.* τῷ πραιποσίτῳ, corresponds to Bonn edition, 202<sub>13</sub>–203<sub>15</sub>; figure 2 (fol. 67<sup>v</sup>), containing the scholion we have discussed, corresponds to 680<sub>12</sub>–681<sub>18</sub> (*inc.* εὐχὰς διὰ τῆς ἡμετέρας ταπεινότητος, *des.* τὸ κοινὸν τοῦ λαοῦ). Unfortunately, most of the other folios are less legible than those reproduced.

Permission to study the Chalki codex having been granted to Dumbarton Oaks, the authors of this note hope to publish a full investigation of this manuscript as soon as circumstances allow it.